

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Kameisha Rashford, )  
                        )  
Plaintiff,           ) Civil Action No. 2:24-cv-4429-BHH  
v.                     )  
                        )  
Merrick B. Garland, )                           **ORDER**  
*Attorney General of the United States;*   )  
*Ur Mendoza Jaddou, Director of the*       )  
*U.S. Citizenship and Immigration*           )  
*Services; and Alejandro Mayorkas,*       )  
*Secretary of the Department of*            )  
*Homeland Security,*                        )  
                        )  
Defendant.           )  
\_\_\_\_\_)

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Kameisha Rashford's pro se ("Plaintiff") complaint seeking to compel adjudication of her pending Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status. (ECF No. 1.) In accordance with Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review.

On September 17, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued an order reviewing Plaintiff's complaint and recommending that the Court summarily dismiss this action without leave to amend for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 7.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court

is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections to the Report have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. **Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 7), and the Court dismisses this action without leave to amend, without prejudice, and without issuance and service of process.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States District Judge

October 7, 2024  
Charleston, South Carolina